In the above-identified Office Action Claims 22 and 24 were rejected on the basis of matters of form. In response, Claim 23 has been cancelled, wherefore Claim 24, which was deemed to be duplicative of Claim 23, is now believed to be in good form.

Also, Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The foregoing amendments to Claim 24 are believed to be satisfactory for bringing that claim into conformance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101, and, again, Claim 23 has been cancelled.

The claims were also rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the cited Gut reference. In response, Applicants point out that the independent claims of the application have been amended, and they are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art for the reasons set forth below.

In particular, according to the present invention, if for example for anticipation purposes, a second data item corresponding to a document is missing in a local storage means, an address of the document data is searched and stored in this storage means. Thus, because the address is available locally, there is no need to download the second data item in the storage means. That is, access to the second data item is performed upon subsequent request to access the second data item, based on the locally stored address that has been searched.

In other words, as stated near the end of the description of exemplary embodiments, with regards to the drawings:

"Storage of the addresses by anticipation thus makes it possible to obtain (download) said document from the location whose address is immediately available locally, that is to say at the storage means 160 of the client device, without waiting for the time necessary for recovery of this address in the network." (Page 17, lines 24-28)

Applicants note that one of the prior art techniques discussed in the preamble portion of the present specification precisely relates to the system and method of Gut.

"The solution known as searching by anticipation, or "prefetching" in English, is also known, which is based on the idea that, whilst a user is browsing on the Internet, the pages which he is assumed to display in the very near future are downloaded automatically in anticipation of their being requested by the user." (page 3, lines 15-19)

and

"However, this solution is not completely satisfactory since very often the data downloaded in anticipation are never used, which means that the method unnecessarily overloads the consumption of the network bandwidth.

As a result, in systems using such a solution, this increase in load contributes to an increase in the waiting time for the requests of the user (requests by the user for non-anticipated data), which has the opposite effect to that sought and degrades performance." (page 3, lines 23 to 32)

As a matter of fact, Gut teaches to download by anticipation the components of a document, to regenerate the document, and to store if in the cache memory, (see, col. 2, lines 27-28 and lines 36-41, col. 5, lines 44-50 and 59-61, step 70, fig. 4 and step 78, fig. 5).

Referring now to the cited Gut reference, as a result of these distinctions between Applicants' claims and the Gut reference, it is believed that the claims as now presented are allowable, wherefore the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3264156v1